

**Congress of the United States**  
**Washington, DC 20515**

February 10, 2020

The Honorable Janet Dhillon  
Chair  
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission  
131 M Street, N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20507

RE: Comment on Notice of Proposed Rulemaking: Official Time in Federal Sector Cases before the Commission, RIN No. 3046-AB00

Dear Chair Dhillon:

We write to express our strong opposition to the proposed rule, “Official Time in Federal Sector Cases before the Commission, RIN No. 3046-AB00.”

Under longstanding regulations, federal agencies are required to grant a “reasonable amount of official time” to all representatives when they assist coworkers in the process of preparing complaints of employment discrimination and responding to agency requests for information.<sup>1</sup> The proposed rule would create an exception, excluding from the official time requirement representatives who serve as an “officer, steward, or otherwise in an official capacity in a labor organization.”<sup>2</sup>

The proposed rule would undermine the rights of federal employees and harm the mission of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and the equal employment opportunity process.

First, the proposed rule would undermine the right of federal employees “to be accompanied, represented, and advised by a representative of complainant’s choice.”<sup>3</sup>

The right of representation has been a requirement that federal agencies are obligated to uphold. Under current regulation, if a discrimination complainant chooses a union representative who also works at her agency, then the agency *must* give both the complainant and her representative official time while they participate in the employment discrimination complaint process.

The effect of the proposed rule would be to subject the right of representation to a manager’s personnel decision: *whether or not* to grant annual leave to the complainant’s union representative. Subjecting a complainant’s representative to the discretion of a manager clearly undermines the right of representation that the regulations require.

---

<sup>1</sup> 29 C.F.R. § 1614.605(b).

<sup>2</sup> 84 Fed. Reg. 67683 (Dec. 11, 2019) (online at [www.federalregister.gov/d/2019-26545](http://www.federalregister.gov/d/2019-26545)).

<sup>3</sup> 29 C.F.R. § 1614.605(a).

Second, the proposed rule undermines the efficiency and effectiveness of the equal employment opportunity process.

Over the past 40 years, complainants have often chosen co-workers who serve in an official capacity with the union to represent them in the employment discrimination complaint process. These representatives are federal workers who volunteer to serve with the union.

Through their repeated experience with the equal employment opportunity process, union representatives gain helpful knowledge. They understand the technical details of the complaint process -- the timelines, particular requirements and protocols. They share that knowledge with the complainant, for whom the complaint process is new and unfamiliar. As a result, complainants can make more effective use of the process that Congress authorized and the EEOC administers when they receive representation from union representatives.

The proposed rule, because it would deny the official time requirement for union representatives, would also deny the experience and expertise that union representatives offer to discrimination complainants. The loss of their experience and expertise will negatively affect the equal employment opportunity process, which will become less efficient and effective as a result.

Third, the proposed rule undermines the mission of the EEOC. The proposed rule would increase both the number of complainants who lack adequate representation, and the financial costs to complainants, who may feel it necessary to hire private counsel to replace the union representation that they received under current rules. Both consequences undermine the mission of the EEOC.

Therefore, we respectfully request that the EEOC reject the proposed rule. Federal employees should continue to be able to choose the representative they prefer, and that choice should continue to include union representatives.

Very truly yours,

Janie Radkin

Mark D. Si

Mike Thompson

Jesus Garcia

John A

Jim Lee

Lillie B. Kearty

Joni E. Lewis

Jim Schumay

Ernie L. Engel

Wm. Lacy Clay

David Van

Brian Agis

Anna Tetra

Debra

Olave A. Hastings

Bill Foster

John Sacramento

John P. Kuh

Alma Adams

Tony Cardenas

Brenda Lawrence

Grace S. Napolitano

Shelia Jackson Lee

Deh Haalul

Al Bani

Jahana Haqqa

Muhammad

Rail M. Hijder

Primita Jeyaraj

W. M. A.

Jack Hoffman

W. M. A.

Rashida Hain

Susan W. W.

W. J. G.

David K. G.

M. L. T.

W. M. A. VA-11

Diana DeLette

Michelle L.

Steph S. L.

Chris Pappas

Fr Kidspetres

Joe W

Jenna G. Eshoo

Daniel T. Kieran

Charlie Crist

Andy Fair

A. Panto

Thomas R. Guzzi

Debbie Dingell

Alan Lowenthal

Matthew A. Cartwright

Earl Blumen

Debbie Wasserman

Duck Skypf

W. Tom

Greg Wass

Cheri Bustos

Frank Pallares

Steve Cohen

Chell R

Gene M

Betty McAfee

Adam Smith

Fred J Saindley

Joe Courtney

Marcia T. Judge

Lucille Royal-Allard

W.H. A

Bob H

John Vargas

Eric Forman

Miss Ais

Lyndee B

Earl R

M V

Pety De Fazi

Judy Chen

Nonna Jones

Debi Bilo Jr.

Judith Speier

Barbara Lee

Corin Lamb

Ro Kh